

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/558,329

Applicant(s)

Stern et al.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Group Art Unit

1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cheryl Juska

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Keith Haupt

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Dec 21, 2000Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: all pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

Gillies, Ott, Lefkowitz

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

We discussed the 112, 1st enablement rejections (essential subject matter not in claims and scope of enablement). Haupt presented arguments based on several case laws. We did not come to an agreement at this time. I did agree to review said case law and discuss the issues with my supervisor upon receipt of an official response. With regard to the prior art rejections, Haupt noted col. 2, lines 48-65 of the present disclosure, wherein the top and bottom yarn faces are described. Haupt argued said faces are a distinguishing feature over the cited prior art. I agreed to review the prior art with this feature in mind. Upon my agreement of said distinguishing feature, we agreed to amend all independent claims, if needed, to reflect said feature.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

CHERYL JUSKA  
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action